



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Livy. See further Lease, *Livy*², §§ 47-49. Cf. also note 5 *infra*.

4. The attitude of Nepos and that of Caesar¹ to the use of these clausulae is practically the same.

5. The pentameter clausula was most frequently used by Livy and Sallust, least frequently by Cicero and Sen. rhet.

6. A complete hexameter verse was used as a clausula twice by Cicero and twice by Caesar (cf. *ftn.*); by Nepos 3 times (14. 4. 2: 23. 7. 1; 10. 3), Sall. once (Cat. 40. 3), by Livy 4 (1. 28. 4: 22. 14. 6; 24. 12; 33. 4; also 21. 49. 3 spondaic), by Sen. rhet. twice (Contr. 5 exc. (p. 279 K.), 9 exc. 2 (p. 451 K.)). It may be added also that Livy in 22. 50. 10 has at the beginning of a sentence an hexameter verse and a half; in the middle, an hexameter in 21. 9. 3; 35. 12; 49. 11; so Sall. C. 19. 5; J. 5. 1, and Cic. Acad. 2. 122. More remarkable is the use of a complete Elegiac distich (*complexi . . . acies*) in Cic., De Or. 3. 20.

In conclusion it is to be remarked that there can be no doubt that in the new edition "*plura nitent*" and that it is worthy of a prominent place in the working library of every student of the Latin language and of its syntactical problems.

EMORY B. LEASE.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

¹ In Cicero, 6 ft.=2 (Inv. 1. 109, P. O. 133); 5 ft.=10 (Inv. 1. 56, De Or. 2. 314, Top. 73, Att. 1. 18. 8; 26. 2: 3. 15. 5: 7. 12. 4: 9. 13. 4: 12. 40. 6, Acad. 2. 80); 4 ft.=9 (De Or. 2. 18; 109; Att. 1. 1. 1; 8. 12 B. 1; 9. 18. 1: 10. 18. 2: 11. 10. 1: 17a, 1, Off. 3. 69). In Caesar, 6 ft.=2 (B. C. 1. 46. 1: 58. 2 (B. G. 5. 57. 3 Meusel)); 5 ft.=7 (1. 40. 6: 2. 5. 5; 31. 3; 5. 57. 3: 7. 78. 2, B. C. 1. 28. 2: 3. 79. 6). It may be added that from the point of view of the clausula there was little difference between the usage of the B. G. and the B. C. The clausula of 5 ft. was also found in Nepos twice (7. 6. 5; 8. 3), 9 times in Livy (1. 15. 2; 22. 6; 55. 1: 21. 18. 5; 40. 10; 49. 9: 40. 5. 8; 32. 7: 45. 16. 2 and 1. 35. 5 spondaic), and 4 in Sen. rhet. (Contr. Pr. 2; 1. 1. 13: 10. 2. 12; 5. 14).

Antigonos Gonatas. WILLIAM WOODTHORPE TARN. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1913.

It was a happy chance that Mr. Tarn's account of the ancient Balkan States was published when these kingdoms were the centre of interest in the modern world. Our modern historians do not permit us to say that history repeats itself, but there are some remarkable coincidences in the two eras although they are separated by more than twenty centuries. The "balance of power" was fought for again and again on the battlefields of Europe and Asia. The value of the supremacy of the seas was demonstrated in no uncertain way

when one of the kings entered upon an ambitious naval programme. Enmities of long standing were forgotten and an *entente* was formed to crush him. There was a tendency to create neutral states, and to exempt sacred places from attack and plunder. In the private and intellectual life of the people there are many points of contact with modern civilization. The movement towards reality appeared in every phase of life, in literature, art, science and philosophy. Universities, too, were organized, and in the disputations of the professors we have something sadly akin to the modern doctor's dissertation.

The central figure in European civilization in the third century was Antigonos Gonatas, and around this character Mr. Tarn has woven the history of Greece and Macedon during his sovereignty. Perhaps no period of Greek history is more difficult to deal with because of the chaotic and contradictory nature of the evidence for the early part of the third century, and since the evidence for the later years of his reign has long since been lost to us. In the earlier period the investigator must be endowed with a critical faculty developed to the highest degree; for the latter a vivid imagination to bridge the gaps. In Mr. Tarn these qualities are apparently most happily combined, and he has succeeded in reconstructing the history of Antigonos' reign with a closer approximation to truth than had hitherto been attained.

The opening chapters are devoted to an account of Antigonos' teachers and the empire of Demetrios. The brief sketches of Menedemos and Zeno and their systems of philosophy are particularly good. In discussing the extent of Demetrios' rule on land, the year 295/4 is taken as a starting point, since in that year he recovered Athens. On the assumption that the eponymos archon was the former democrat, Tarn follows Ferguson in believing that a coalition government with moderates from both parties was constituted. But Olympiodoros is not an uncommon name and there is no proof of identity. Unless Stratokles has reformed, any coalition government with him as a member would be largely Stratokles. After his death which seems to have come somewhere between 295 and 293, there was a better chance for moderate policies to prevail, and it was then that Phaidros came to the helm and guided the state through the *δύσκολοι καιροί* to a reestablished democracy. The civic troubles are reflected in the abandonment for a time of the usual tribal rotation by which the secretaries were appointed. The establishment of the new cycle in 291/0 is proof that a certain measure of democracy was granted by Demetrios on the advice of Phaidros.

The chronological problems in Greek history between 290 and 260 B. C. have been a favorite battleground for the histo-

rians in recent years. The debate centres about the secretary-cycle, and its relative merits as compared with the evidence gathered from literary sources. Tarn has far outstripped his predecessors in dealing with the problem, and he has proved beyond a doubt that the cycle and literary evidence can only be reconciled by assuming a break in the former at some point between 294 and 290. Diokles must be dated in 288/7 B. C., and the revolt of Athens from Demetrios in 289/8. The weakness of Tarn's chronology for the succeeding years is due to his too faithful acceptance of Beloch's theories without sufficient examination; for by keeping Polyuktos-Hieron in 275-273 B. C. he was compelled to assume unusual breaks in the cycle in 285-282 B. C. which could not be accounted for. If Tarn had allowed the cycle to continue without interruption from 291 to 262 he would have found the true solution of the chronological puzzle. We would outline the course of events as follows: Athens regained her independence in 289 and was free until 279. The formal abdication of Demetrios came in 286/5 when Antigonos assumed the title of King with, however, only a few isolated towns as his actual kingdom. Athens probably remained loyal to Lysimachos until Seleucos offered them a more tempting alliance, and after Lysimachos murdered his son, they must have cast in their lot definitely with the ruler of Asia. While the kings were fighting for the throne of Macedon, Antigonos had to wait patiently as *ephedros* until he could engage the winner. Meanwhile he was free to attack Athens and the city was taken by stratagem in the early spring of 279 B. C. Death proved to be his best ally in Macedon, and then the Gallic invaders removed Keraunos who was slain in defending the kingdom he had so treacherously acquired. Antigonos now claimed his old inheritance, but probably only part of this unruly country was willing to acknowledge him. It made no material difference at the time for the second invasion of the Gauls in 278 put an end to any attempt to hold the northern lands against the invader. Antigonos withdrew to Asia and watched the course of events from there. In 276 his opportunity came, and striking a decisive blow at Lysimacheia he not only drove out the Gauls, but by the prestige of his victory, regained the throne of Macedon. There is no evidence that Athens had made any attempt to regain her independence during these three years. In fact it seems clear that Athens, under the moderate Phaidros as representative of the king, remained loyal from her capitulation in 279 until the outbreak of the Chremonidean war. There was, of course, a nationalist party at all times, and subsidized by Egypt after 273 B. C. The Nationalists, however, never dared openly to defy Antigonos, although they did send an embassy to Pyrrhos after his wonderful successes in

Macedon inviting him to come over and help them throw off the chains of Antigonid rule. Pyrrhos refused their invitation and went on to Sparta. The Nationalist party promptly withdrew from view and nothing more is heard from them until the coalition of all Greece against Macedon in 267 when the Chremonidean war broke out. Athens held out longer than any of her Greek allies but Antigonos was too strong for her and in the fall of 262 the city yielded once more to the forces of the king.

If the history of the years 290-262 is built about the framework which we have briefly outlined, epigraphical and literary sources will be found to be in general accord. A new and independent examination of the dates of the Delphic archons is urgently needed in settling some of the problems preceding and during the Chremonidean war.

In dealing with the last years of Antigonos' reign, where inscriptional and literary evidence fail us almost completely, Tarn has succeeded in reconstructing the story with remarkable skill. Athens practically drops out of the reckoning and the chief interest of these years is found in the struggle between Macedon and Egypt for the supremacy of the sea, and in the breaking down of the Antigonid system of government in the dependent states. The former is a story of wonderful achievement in the face of apparently unsurmountable obstacles. The latter is a story of dismal failure. The tyrannies which he had established had to give way before the new spirit developing in Greece. The Achaean League, however, originated in a reaction against Macedon, and never got beyond that limitation. Moreover Greece was too much obsessed with the idea of the city state to permit the development of any sort of federal league. The importance of the reign of the Antigonids to civilization is thus expressed: From 277 to 168 Macedonia, under the Antigonids was the shield and bulwark of Greece, preserving Greek civilization from the possibility of being swamped by northern barbarism before its work was done, before it had yet taught Rome and through Rome the whole modern world; Macedonia and her kings stood in the gap till Rome was ready and able, with greater resources, to take up the work. Republican Rome herself, when her time came hardly and with many failures kept out the northerners; the Antigonids on the whole managed it with success. This is the real importance of the Antigonid dynasty in history. The world of classical scholarship owes to Mr. Tarn a debt of gratitude for having told this story so well.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON.